Appln No. 10/733,823

Amdt date November 7, 2005

Reply to Office action of September 6, 2005 and October 5, 2005

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The above-identified patent application has been amended and reconsideration and reexamination are hereby requested.

Claims 7 - 12 are allowable. Claims 1 and 8 have previously been cancelled. Claims 2 - 6 and 13 - 17 have now been cancelled.

In the Office Action of September 6, 2005, the Examiner had rejected Claim 9 for being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and objected to Claim 10 for being dependent on cancelled Claim 8. In an Amendment mailed September 20, 2005, the Applicant amended the language of Claim 9 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions and corrected the informality in Claim 10.

In the Advisory Action of October 5, 2005, the Examiner noted that Claims 7 - 12 would now be allowable and that Applicant's Amendment of September 20, 2005 would be entered for purposes of appeal, but that the above-identified patent application is still not in condition for allowance because previously withdrawn "Claims 2 - 6 and 13 - 17 need to be cancelled." The Applicant has cancelled Claims 2 - 6 and 13 - 17 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion.

Appln No. 10/733,823 Amdt date November 7, 2005 Reply to Office action of September 6, 2005 and October 5, 2005

The Applicant believes that the above-identified patent application is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

Richard J. Paciulan

Reg. No. 28,248 626/795-9900

RJP/MSG/mac MAC PAS651391.1-\*-11/7/05 1:59 PM